



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

11/7

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,528	03/30/2004	Toshimasa Kobayashi	09794353-0033	5835

26263 7590 03/08/2007  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. BOX 061080  
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER  
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER
----------

MULPURI, SAVITRI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2812

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.



## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/26/2007 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 12- 18, 20-21, 27-39,542, 44, 46, 48,50,52,54,46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoki et al. (2005/0076830 A).

Motoki et al teaches laterally growing GaN layer on the GaN substrate (see abstract detailed description). Motoki particularly teaches striped shaped second

Art Unit: 2812

regions and at least one of the second regions having a c-axis inverted relative to the first regions (fig.5a-5b and para0187).

Claimed shapes of second regions (claim,19) and the claimed distance between two adjacent second regions(claims 12-17 and the claimed diameter of the second regions and relative diameters of second and third regions are obvious because the dislocation density of second region higher than the dislocation density of the first region. Claimed defect densities in claim 29-30 in first and second and third regions are obvious in the invention of Motoki et al . It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to chose different shapes of second region, different distance between he second regions and different diameter of second and third regions through routine optimization to obtain reduced dislocation densities in the active region, where the device is fabricated.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Double Patenting***

Claims 1, 42, 44,46,50,52,54,56 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending Application No. 1-79,80 .

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claims 1,42,44,46,50,52,54,56 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over

claims 1,79,80 of copending Application No. 11/148,771. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the scope of instant claims are encompassed by the scope of the application claims, wherein specifically "growing layers nitride III-V semiconductor layer for forming light emitting device" is recited".

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Savitri Mulpuri whose telephone number is 57-72-1677. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8 a.m. to 4.30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Lebentritt, can be reached on 571-272-1873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 2812

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Savitri Mulpuri  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2812